

11/19/2003 12:31 8299087

LEAFLEATHE

PAGE 01

FAX

(1 page reply, 1 page extension fee form w/credit card no.) total=2 pages  
TO: JEAN MARQUEITE GOODWIN (fax) 703-308-7382  
FROM: TERRY K. BRYANT (fax) 360-829-9087

Application/Control Number 09/900/599/Terry K. Bryant 561-308-4506  
Art Unit 2841/TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800  
REQUEST FOR THREE MONTH EXTENSION 11/18/03

Dear Examiner Jeanne-Marquette Goodwin:

Please accept the following changes and corrections as they apply to the informalities presented.

Reply to Claim Objections

Claim 1-4 changes as follows:

- a. Claim 1, line 5: delete "the slides," add: "reforming flexible area of polymer housing"
- b. Claim 1, lines 5 and 7: delete; "the flexible shape": add: self-reforming flexible area of polymer housing"
- c. Claim 1, line 8; and claim 4, lines 1-2: delete; "it's original shape": add: the self-reforming polymer housing"
- d. Claim 2, line 2: delete: "to run quickly run through", add: "to pass through the chambers at a faster speed than normally allowed by prior art"
- e. Claim 2, line 1; claim 3, line 1; and claim 4, line 1: delete: "the step of," add: "comprising of the step of" to better claim the invention.
- f. Claim 3, line 1: delete "comprising of forming an basic or similar shape", add: "comprising of forming a basic, or similar shape"
- g. Claim 4, line 1: delete: "comprising of the flexibility of the hour-glass shape", add: "like the shape of an hourglass"

With the concept of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for obviousness for rejections set forth by the Office action the following is a refutable of the obviousness that the present invention is and was not obvious to one having ordinary skills as a whole of the patent worthy and uniqueness so that the subject matter pertaining would not have been obvious to one skilled in the art. The following is an attempt to show that the unique of the present invention is of such a nature that it stand as subject matter that all claim rejection as cited references will be obvious to one skilled in the art and each prior application will be refuted as follows:

All Patents cited would have been obvious of any changes are similarities due to the length of time lapsed involved in relationship the patent itself and the embodiment of the present invention should have been easily seen that no flexibility of the polymer is cited as the same as described in the aforementioned application for the present invention. With this understanding the function of the those previous inventions cited show that the use of flexible polymer is not obvious as the method specified and one skilled in the arts would obviously have not been able to see it such, thus, would allow the present invention to be acceptable as a unique new method of benefiting the use of the hour glass.

The above argument applies to those claim rejections are basically of combined similarity and have been argue as such however, the following cited claim rejection is being argued in detail to facilitate the most advantageous view of the function in regards to difference in methods and should it be necessary each patent cited will be argued in detail, in order to appropriately respond to your request as this is an attempt to reply as applies to all cited previous cited patents along/w the following cited objection that has a different argument of it's function:

Reference: Pat # 5,023,582 Mikels, though having a flexible transparent plastic comprising of a first and second chamber as described, it is obvious that the main function was not involved with the housing itself as being the complete functional method of the invention, rather the *sleeve, sockets and membranes*. The simple fact that Mikel's patent was granted over 12 years ago shows that there was no comparison to the new invention in mention. It is obvious that one skilled in the art would have not have found the subject matter to similar at the time of the invention, due to the fact that the function was not center around the direct "housing" itself as is the present invention, which completely stipulates the method for improvement encompasses the housing solely and thus, the differences are such that no person would have found the present new application as pertaining to the same method:

12/08/2003 RT  
01 FC:2853

Thank you for your consideration and attention and please feel free to call or fax should I need to provide more drafted information, or if you have any suggestions. *Thanks again for your help!*

T.K. Bryant  
561-308-4506

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

FAX RECEIVED

*Please forward a copy to Examiner Mr. David Mente*

*AS/Ext. of Times/*  
*12/5/03*